

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 02 2008

60,469-242; 5132

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Monzon
Serial No.: 10/561,557
Filed: 12/19/2005
Examiner: Pico, Eric E.
Group Art Unit: 3654
Title: COMPACT BEDPLATE WITH INTEGRATED,
ACCESSIBLE DEAD END HITCHES

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Dear Sir:

Reconsideration of the final rejection mailed July 2, 2008 is requested.

The Examiner argues that there is a reason to combine the Nakagaki, et al. publication with the device shown in the Orrman, et al. publication. The Examiner argues that the reason that this combination would have been suggested is "knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art that extending the dead end hitches above a vertically lowermost surface would facilitate the connection between the dead end hitch and the bedplate and protect the dead end hitch." First, this alleged knowledge is not supported in the prior art. Where is the knowledge evidenced? This is a glaring example of why hindsight is the sole motivation for this combination.

Moreover, Nakagaki, et al. does not disclose a dead end hitch attached to the bedplate. As pointed out previously, Nakagaki, et al. attaches its dead end hitches on opposed sides of the elevator car, and thus there is simply no support for the Examiner's alleged combination.